

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP COMMENTS
REDDING, CA

<i>Date:</i>	June 13, 2005 1:00-5:00 pm	<i>Location:</i>	Redding Redding Memorial Veterans Hall 1605 Yuba Street, Redding
<i>Meeting Purpose and Goals:</i>	To hear and record public comment on the Public Review Draft of the California Water Plan Update 2005		
<i>All meeting materials, including the PowerPoint presentation, are available at the California Water Plan website at: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm</i>			

Presenters:

Kamyar Guivetchi, Program Manager, CA Department of Water Resources (DWR)
Todd Manley, Advisory Committee member, Northern CA Water Association
Austin McInerny, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy, CA State University, Sacramento
John Mills, Advisory Committee member, Regional Council of Rural Counties
Dwight Russell, District Chief, Northern District, DWR

Introduction: Format and Purpose

Austin McInerny, meeting facilitator, introduced the presenters and DWR staff and welcomed everyone to the first CA Water Plan Update 2005 Public Input Workshop. He thanked the County of Shasta for providing the meeting facility. The purpose of the meeting was for the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR) to receive public input and to share ideas for the Public Review Draft of the CA Water Plan.

The workshop format was interactive. Participants sat in table groups. The meeting consisted of 3 presentations by Kamyar Guivetchi (DWR), each followed by group discussion at each table. Advisory Committee members Todd Manley and John Mills spoke on behalf of the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Advisory Committee, and DWR Northern District Chief Dwight Russell gave a presentation on the Sacramento River and Mountain Counties Regional Reports, which are located in Volume 3 of the CA Water Plan. Each table station had a DWR staff person who helped record the group discussion on a flipchart. Each table group chose a reporter among themselves who would summarize the group discussion to the entire audience on behalf of the group. Near the end of the meeting, time was reserved for a traditional spoken comment period where individuals could address the audience with prepared statements. For detailed description of the format, see the “Working in Groups” handout.

Part 1 – Agenda Items A and B

A) Background & Overview / B) Comments from the Advisory Committee

This *Water Plan Update* is different than previous updates. It was prepared using a new process. There are many new features in the Water Plan. It will be continually updated as new information becomes available, and it presents a strategic plan and framework for action developed with substantial

stakeholder input. Kamyar Guivetchi spoke on the background and strategic planning process used in the Water Plan. Advisory Committee members Todd Manley and John Mills explained the *Advisory Committee View*, which is a 4-page handout that summarizes the wide level of agreement and disagreement among the 65-member Advisory Committee over the last four and a half years, and the remaining areas of uncertainty.

Below is a summary of the comments made at the tables:

Thinking about the presentation on Background and Overview by DWR and Comments from the Advisory Committee, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>Table 1:</p> <p>+ Liked the 14 recommendations; however white font is hard to read.</p> <p>Table 2:</p> <p>+ Agree with tying land use with water supply and quality.</p> <p>Table3:</p> <p>+ No comments.</p>	<p>Table 1:</p> <p>Δ Can't follow Flow Diagram – needs graphics</p> <p>Δ Use something like the diagram from 1994 Update that shows water distribution.</p> <p>Δ More emphasis on seriousness of water conditions in California ASAP in document.</p> <p>Δ Emphasize need for more conservation – add as a new Initiative on Framework for Action.</p> <p>Δ Emphasize need for more surface water storage.</p> <p>Table 2:</p> <p>Δ Extend the Water Plan's scope to discussions of the Western U.S., regional uses beyond CA state borders (Colorado River, Lake Mead).</p> <p>Δ For the Framework for Action, have the Initiatives and Foundational Actions on parallel tracks to achieve goals on a regional basis. Have them linked between these parallel tracks.</p> <p>Table3:</p> <p>Δ Process should be more "regional."</p> <p>Δ What is meant by "integrated"? Define it more explicitly.</p> <p>Individual Comment forms:</p> <p>Δ Framework for Action should show the Foundational Action and Initiatives proceeding on parallel but linked tracks.</p>	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will comments be addressed? Will they be responded to specifically? • How is urban growth (especially in Northern CA) addressed in the plan? • Assumptions are not clear for water supply in the future, by region, by state. • Clarify assumptions – do we have a water shortage in Northern CA? <p>Table 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why wasn't the print media more involved in this process? Why not PBS? Not aware of content/discussion of this plan prior to today. • Should California's water be kept exclusively in California? • Is there is a region that is doing more than the others? • Has attended many CALFED meetings; how come the Planning Commission person has just now heard of this one? • By allowing CALFED's input, you are allowing the Federal government to have input into the State's water projects • Is desalination discussed in the Plan? • Don't want the Federal government to dictate what happens to the state's water. • Would like to see a time

	<p>Otherwise, the true potential for water use efficiency may not be realized if not considered in the context of integrated regional water management.</p> <p>Δ Include other States in the Western U.S.</p>	extension past July.
--	---	----------------------

Part 2 – Agenda Items C and D

C) California Water Today & Water Balance / D) Regional Reports

It is important for a strategic plan to have a clear description of current conditions and accomplishments. Chapter 3 of Volume 1 (Strategic Plan) is called “California Water Today.” As the largest chapter in Volume 1, it is intended to provide education and reference information. It gives general findings from both statewide and regional perspectives as well as the perspectives of different water use sectors (agriculture, urban, and environment). Volume 3 of the Water Plan has more detailed information on each of the 10 hydrologic regions (plus additional reports for Statewide, Mountain Counties, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta), covering conditions, challenges, accomplishments, and future opportunities of the Region presented, as well as quantified water balances for supply and use. Kamyar Guivetchi presented the slides on California Water Today and statewide water balances, and Northern District Chief Dwight Russell presented the Volume 3 regional reports for the Sacramento River hydrologic region.

Thinking about the description of California Water Today and the Regional Reports, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>Table 1:</p> <p>+ No comments.</p> <p>Table 2:</p> <p>+ No comments.</p> <p>Table3:</p> <p>+ No comments.</p> <p>Individual Comment forms:</p> <p>+ Thanks for mentioning the North Coast “Regional Challenges” increases in groundwater use, foothill development, and water quality septs.</p>	<p>Table 1:</p> <p>Δ Trinity flow decision needs to be better addressed; major source of inflow.</p> <p>Δ State to Regions, graphics present action in different reference scale (TAF or MAF – choose one or the other)</p> <p>Δ Shows examples of good land use planning that reduces impact on groundwater recharge zones.</p> <p>Table3:</p> <p>Δ Add historic California tribes to the consulting list (not just Federally recognized tribes)</p> <p>Individual Comment forms:</p> <p>Δ The presentation talks about Dry Year Challenges, but there was no mention of challenges</p>	<p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the Water Plan address regional management of infrastructure; i.e. Shasta Dam? • How are groundwater quality impacts addressed concerning agricultural fuel storage? • How are pesticide impacts addressed? • Are important controversial items being avoided? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonpoint source pollution • Meth lab sludge • Marijuana fertilizers • Legal enforcement and funding • Population control? <p>Table 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did you utilize CALSIM

	<p>(shortages) in years of average precipitation and runoff.</p> <p>Δ Use common units – the graph representing the entire state is in millions of acre-feet, but regional graphs are in thousands of acre-feet.</p> <p>Δ State should develop better groundwater rights.</p>	<p>Model 3 in CWP? [<i>no</i>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you plan to have hardcopies in libraries? [<i>yes, DWR will print more when document is finalized</i>] • Plan does not adequately address privatization of groundwater. <p>Individual Comment forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the size of aquifers in each hydrologic region? • Levee responsibility from court case – will that apply to aquifers? • As demand grows in the south, reservoirs are implied in the north – is this a demand balance? • Are there any estimates of aquifer volume capacity in any of the hydrologic regions?
--	---	--

Question and Answer Segment:

Q: The courts held that the State is liable for damages if a levee is not maintained (*Paterno v. State of California*). Does the State have responsibility for maintaining aquifers?

A: There is not a corresponding State decision of the *Paterno* case that says the State of California is responsible for the groundwater system. Groundwater basins and groundwater extraction are county-related issues, not a State issue. Two years ago DWR has published an update to Bulletin 118, which is an assessment of California's groundwater basins. The condition of the basin with regards to groundwater quality is under the jurisdiction of the Regional Water Quality Control Boards. They look at the groundwater to ensure that it is suitable to uses identified in their basin plan.

Q: How does the current Plan address water contract renewal process?

A: Yes, in Volume 1 Chapter 3 (California Water Today), there is a discussion about State and Federal water contract renewals.

Q: Does the Plan address land retirement?

A: Yes, one of the resource management strategies in Volume 2 is called "Other Strategies," and Irrigated Land Retirement is in there. It discusses programs that are occurring and how they relate to CVPIA or other activities.

Part 3 – Agenda Items E and F

E) Preparing for the Future (Scenarios) / F) Diversifying Responses (Strategies)

This *Water Plan Update 2005* recognizes that many things may alter water use between now and 2030. For that reason, the *Update* contains a description of several possible future scenarios. Uncertainty about future course or events creates a need for multiple options to address opportunities and challenges. Further, the Plan recognizes that one size does not fit all. Each Region will have specific

requirements or needs that may not apply across the entire state. Implementing multiple options (diverse management strategies) allows managers to adapt to a variety of circumstances. Volume 2: Resource Management Strategies has narrative descriptions of 25 different strategies available to water managers to help them reduce water demand, improve operational efficiency and transfers, increase water supply, improve water quality, and practice resource stewardship.

Thinking from the perspective of 2030 are there things about this approach to plan for the future you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Estimate the safe yield of groundwater in valley aquifers. Δ Indicate the size and natural recharge of aquifers. <p>Table3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Should not use CALFED's data in the Water Plan, feel it is erroneous. 	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that water agencies don't have land planning authority. Water managers can only react to growth. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well do these scenarios represent our future? • What would a scenario look like if the population does not increase? • What is the assumption of how groundwater recharge changes when agricultural lands convert to urban uses? i.e., the "natural" state of soil vs. paved surfaces with runoff. • How are multi-year droughts handled? • As agricultural lands are converted to urban, does it use as much water? <p>Table 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 maf groundwater deficit – where? • Should the Volume be put into a regional spectrum, instead of California in general.

Part 4 – Additional Public Comments

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Presentation difficult to follow. Δ Not enough direction for group discussion. Δ Difficulty in getting the general public to understand without making them hysterical. 	

Part 5 – Formal Public Comments (in order of presentation):
--

Members of the public were welcome to present statements in the formal style of a traditional public hearing. Six members of the public were registered for speaker comments:

Walt Zwicker:

Mr. Zwicker was concerned about the threat that rising sea levels pose to the water quality of the San Francisco Bay Delta, and the pressure that would be placed on Butte County to send more of its water downstream to push back the salt. He was also concerned that his area has been mandated by the state to build enough houses for almost twice its present population.

Mr. Zwicker submitted written comments which are posted on the CA Water Plan Public Comments website at <http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/comments/update2005/prdcomments.cfm>

Pat Zwicker:

Ms. Zwicker referred to Volume 2, Chapter 26 (Other Strategies) which discussed irrigated land fallowing. Some farmers are planning to fallow a portion of their lands in order to sell water. The fallowing could result in many negative effects for people in Butte County and other counties. Significant losses include incomes from selling the crops, jobs working the fields, jobs doing crop dusting, grain harvesting and storage. Secondary losses could be house payments, unemployment, retail stores, and groceries.

Ms. Zwicker would like to see a statewide mitigation program. The inadequate fees being charged to water sellers do not meet the administrative costs of running the program, much less the secondary costs. Taxpayers would be burdened with the unmet costs. She urged for action to be taken at a higher level than local level.

Ms. Zwicker submitted written comments which are posted on the CA Water Plan Public Comments website at <http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/comments/update2005/prdcomments.cfm>

Caleen Sisk-Franco, Winnemem Wintu Tribe:

Ms. Sisk-Franco introduced herself as the leader of the Winnemem Wintu Tribe, whose traditional territory is on the McCloud River watershed area that feeds Lake Shasta. She was concerned about barriers to tribal participation. This was the first time her tribe has been able to participate in California's plans. The Winnemem Wintu tribe can only participate on a limited basis because it is not a federally recognized tribe. They have to come to this kind of meeting for the State to hear their tribal concerns because the government forgot that they flooded their land, moved their people off the river, and took everything. Now, the government is saying that the tribe does not have any water rights, land, or anything else left.

The Winnemem Wintu Tribe remains here, still speaking up for the salmon. The government stopped the salmon from going up any of the rivers above the dam. Now the government is talking about having salmon spawn in coldwater pool below dam, but those fish are supposed to go the high country.

Ms. Sisk-Franco stated that the Winnemum Wintu Tribe has water rights that have never been discussed, settled, or given up. The tribe retains those water rights because they are not a federally recognized tribe. They are aboriginal rights to the water. The tribe wants a plan to return the salmon to the upper rivers: the Upper Sacramento, the Pit River, and the McCloud.

Mark Franco, Winnemem Wintu Tribe

Mr. Franco introduced himself as the headman of the Village of Kerekmet, one of the tribal villages of the Winnemem Wintu people. He was concerned with the inclusion of CALFED data and its local surface storage projects in the California Water Plan. CALFED proposes raising Shasta Dam, Sites Offstream Storage Reservoir, the enlargement of the Los Vaqueros Reservoir, and the proposed Temperance Flat Dam on the San Joaquin River. These projects will produce little water at a high public cost and harm to the environment. He found it interesting that a bar chart in the Water Plan suggests that more water supply could be produced from cloud seeding than the CALFED storage projects.

Mr. Franco stated that the Winnemem Wintu Tribe is not against creating places for water to be stored for the people of California. One of its major concerns, however, is that the tribe is not included in the discussion of how the water will be used. They retain aboriginal rights to the water. In 1937 when the U.S. government passed the Central Valley Project Indian Lands Acquisition Act which was signed into law in 1941, they promised several things. The Bureau of Reclamation promised that the tribe would have land to live on in exchange for 4,483 acres of allotment lands held along the McCloud River. They promised the tribe money for infrastructure rebuilding, for education, for establishment of roads and schools, and other things that the tribe had prior to that. They also promised the tribe a cemetery for the burial of the dead. The Bureau of Reclamation did create a cemetery, located in Shasta Lake City, but now the tribe cannot bury their dead there because, according to the government, they are not the people for whom the cemetery was built. It was created for the "Shasta Reservoir Indians." There are no Shasta Reservoir Indians because there was no Shasta Reservoir.

The tribe has asked for a resolution from the Environmental Justice Subcommittee of CALFED, which was presented before the Bay Delta Public Advisory Committee. They called for the removal of the Shasta Dam from the CALFED Project, until such time that the government makes good on its promises that were signed into law in 1941. Recently the State has pulled its funding for the CALFED Shasta Dam improvement. The tribe has also struggled to ensure that the State of California does not become involved with more work on the McCloud River because of violations to the Natural Resources Code, which calls for the McCloud River to be maintained in its Wild & Scenic State.

Mr. Franco stated that the tribe came to DWR today to listen to the presentation and be part of the process. That is what America is about, where we all have a chance to have our voices heard. For so many years our California Indians have not been heard. He was glad to be here, and was glad his young nephew could be here to learn about how things work. Mr. Franco urged everyone in the audience to submit their comments and voice their concerns, because the Winnemum Wintu for so many years have not been allowed to be part of this.

The tribe supports the Water Plan Update's non-dam water management investments, including water use efficiency, recycling, and groundwater treatment. Mr. Franco recommended that people look at the website for Friends of the River, an environmental group that supports the tribes efforts to protect the McCloud River.

Mr. Franco was concerned about DWR's responsibilities with regard to the sale of groundwater to private companies. In Bolivia, people must have government permits to collect the rainwater that

comes off their roofs. The permits are issued by private water companies because they sell the water. Mr. Franco feared that if we continue to allow for privatization of water, and if DWR and the people of California do not look for our interests, then we may come to a point where major conglomerates would own the water. He concluded by saying that the CALFED water projects would cause Northern Californians to have to buy their water at a higher price.

Jerry Hurley:

Mr. Hurley felt that the workshop presentation should have begun by showing where California fits within the water supply environment of the western United States because it is all one big mix, especially along the Colorado River. We are not “California Island.” As water levels fall on the Colorado River, that affects every state in the West. If the river becomes in more trouble, then California will be in trouble too. Shasta Lake fell in many recent months; it could be devastated year after year. There are no projections in the Water Plan for even a two-year drought.

Mr. Hurley was also concerned about water quality and aquifer contamination. He would like to hear, decade by decade, how many wells have been declared contaminated the State of California. He believed that the number is in the thousands, and that the number is not getting smaller. He did not like to see lands being sprayed with toxic substances because they affect water quality in streams and will eventually percolate down into the aquifers. Almost everyone here drinks bottled water because they have seen reports on their water systems. We are blessed with clean water in Redding, but there are parts of the state where they do not drink the groundwater at all. We need to look at water conservation plans as a member of the Western States.

Mr. Hurley asked what are the actual measurements of the top dozen aquifers in the state? How many are being replenished, and how many continue to fall? In places like Santa Clara County, San Jose, the water is falling drastically. Are these aquifers actually improving?

Mr. Hurley was concerned about the status of future water demand trends as they relate to land use. As we see these increased population projections, what will happen to the demand for water? When someone says there is less water being used for agriculture, it is because thousands of acres of agriculture are being converted to residential. Some of those residences consume as much water as the agricultural operations did before. As he understood it, California will receive less water from the Colorado River. That has to be made up, probably from Shasta Lake. We can say that agriculture isn't using as much, but you drive down I-5 and you will see land that a year ago was agricultural but is not now. It all requires water.

Mr. Hurley was concerned about water supplies not keeping up with future demands unless Californians use serious conservation. He moved from the state of Colorado; in the summer before last, the drought situation was so bad that they did not allow nurseries to sell garden plants or any plant that required watering. He watched the water wars in the eastern slope of Colorado state, and felt we may not be far from it.

Barbara Hennigan, League of Women Voters:

Ms. Hennigan said she was heartened with this kind of meeting, where people could sit around the table in discussion. She said that 2005 was the one-hundredth anniversary of the start of the Owens Valley Project. She had recently attended a state League of Women Voters convention in Anaheim. They were trying to carry a resolution about water. She used to think that people in Northern California were sensitive about water. She was surprised at how apprehensive people in Southern California were when someone from the North starts talking about water. Their vision is that

somehow Northern Californians are going to stop water going south. The one issue that everyone could agree upon was water quality. It is the high quality water of the North Coast Region, the clean Sacramento River, that Southern Californians use to bring their local supplies to drinking water standards. From the point of view of the North, perhaps our best protection is to understand that we have to protect the water. From the Southern California point of view, it does not matter how much water they receive from the North if the water has been degraded.

Ms. Hennigan felt that meetings and public processes like this essentially means that Owens Valley cannot happen again because nothing happens secretly or in a vacuum. She was hopeful about the DWR's new open approach and hopes that DWR will expand upon its public processes.

Part 6 – Closing

Kamyar and Austin thanked the audience for participating in the public comment workshop and for their comments. He reminded everyone that the public review period will last through July 22, to allow for 60 days since the release of the printed Public Review Draft document.

The final comment deadline is July 22.

Attendance:

Public:

Ed Christofferson, CH2M Hill
David Coxey, Bella Vista Water District
Sheldon Fort, U. Prep School
Mark Franco, Winnemem Wintu Tribe
Heather Hacking, ChicoER
Brenda Haynes, Assemblyman Doug LaMalfa
Barbara Hennigan, League of Women Voters – Butte County
Jerry Hurley, Taxpayer
Ken Jordan, Acid
Dan Little, Shasta County
Todd Manley, Northern California Water Association
Marilyn Meissner
John S. Mills, Regional Council of Rural Counties
Pat Minturn, Shasta County
Ernie Ohlin, Tehama County
Gracious Palmer, Shasta Lake Planning Commission
Bruce Ross, Redding Record Searchlight
Paul Shigley, California Planning and Development Reprot
Caleen Sisk-Franco, Winnemem Wintu Tribe
Bruce Smith, League of Women Voters
Van Tenney, Glen Colusa Irrigation District
Gary Tollerson
Mike Urkov, CH2M Hill
Eric Wedemeyer, Shasta County Water Agency
Redding Workshop Comments – June 13, 2005

Pat Zwicker
Walt Zwicker

Staff:

Dona Calder, DWR
Xavier "Tito" Cervantes, DWR
Paul Dabbs, DWR
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR
Todd Hillaire, DWR
Austin McInerny, CCP
Glen Pearson, DWR
Mark Rivera, DWR
Dwight P. Russell, DWR
Jessica Salinas, DWR
David Sumi, CCP